

*Safe Integration  
Bancroft*

STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Data Processing

FROM

[REDACTED] Deputy Director for Processing

SUBJECT

: SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board  
of Directors

I believe that there are several SAFE related issues that the ODP Board of Directors should address. Some of them are currently being discussed by Processing and SAFE personnel but the progress towards the resolution of issues is slow. In truth, the issues are better addressed at the office level, for they represent direction in ODP policy, and not technical disagreements.

Issue #1 - Should CPU's in the SAFE and Ruffing Centers be able to direct output to a common set of printers?

Comment - The requirements of both SAFE and systems operating in the Ruffing Center call for printers located in user locations. It seems reasonable that the CPU's in both centers should be able to direct output to the same printers so that we would never need 2 partially used printers sitting side by side--one for SAFE and one for Ruffing Center systems. The printers in the common point would likewise be sharable.

Issue #2 - Why is there an arbitrary restriction on the number of SAFE terminals that can access Ruffing Center CPU's?

Comment - The design of the BUS should allow free access from any SAFE terminal to any CPU in the Ruffing Center. The design of the BUS should treat access to the Ruffing Center CPU's no differently than access

SUBJECT: SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board of Directors

to a SAFE CPU. The current design sets an arbitrary limit on the number of the terminals that can have access. In the NFAC Five-Year ADP Plan, they state "Smooth communications between systems like CDS, SAFE, ETECS, Genographics, and ODP will be an absolute requirement to insure the timeliness of the intelligence product.

STATINTL      Issue #3 - Will the initial design of the BUS allow for communication between a Delta Data terminal and a Ruffing Center CPU?

Comment - Everyone agrees that the BUS will replace the copper wire we have today. But why isn't [redacted] tasked to provide a system that will allow the Delta Data to communicate with an ODP CPU? It is not sufficient to say that they will worry about it later. Design trade offs are best accomplished, before hardware and software are built, not afterwards. This issue is too important to just hope it will work effectively later on.

Issue #4 - Why shouldn't the new SAFE terminal join the family of standard ODP equipment?

Comment - The procurement of the new SAFE terminal gives ODP an opportunity to have a relatively inexpensive desk top terminal available to all our customers. The initial design of the terminal should simply allow it to be connected to the current ODP network just like a Delta Data. Users of our systems, in addition to NFAC may want to use the new SAFE terminal. In fact, SAFE customers should be able to access a SAFE CPU via a Delta Data. If TEMPEST Delta Data's could be used in out-buildings the new terminal procurement might not have to worry about the expense of a TEMPEST SAFE terminal.

SUBJECT: SAFE Relation Issues for the ODP Board  
of Directors

The conclusion from Issue #2, 3 and 4,  
is simply that the initial design of the  
BUS should allow access from any customer  
terminal to any ODP CPU.

Issue #5 - Why is there no requirement for a BUS  
network in outbuildings that can communicate  
with the Headquarters BUS?

Comment - The Agency will continually run short of  
space in Headquarters and the number of  
CIA people in outbuildings will only grow.  
The architecture of BUS should allow for  
a BUS in outbuildings with communications to  
the Headquarters BUS.

Issue #6 - What can be done to ease the transition  
of SAFE from a standalone project to one  
that becomes an integral part of ODP.

Comment - Everyone agrees that the SAFE project will  
be folded into the other ODP organizations.  
This transition should be a gradual process.  
It is too big a project and far too important  
for it to be thrown over a wall for someone  
to catch. I would suggest that an appropriate  
set of people from Processing and Applications  
participate in reviewing the formal speci-  
fications that are developed and participating  
in design reviews. They would be there to  
make comments , and not to have any veto  
power. This would go a long way in providing  
a smooth transition into the current non-  
SAFE operating components of ODP.

STATINTL